IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Crl.Misc. No.23168-M of 2007
Date of Decision:- 18.04.2007

Karambir @ Pappu ....Petitioner(s)

through
Mr.A.S.Trikha, Advocate

vs.

State of Haryana & ors. ....Respondent(s)

through
None.

***

CORAM:-HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA KANT.

***

1) Whether Reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2) To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3) Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

***

SURYA KANT, J.

The petitioner has been denied parole for house repairs on the ground that his previous release on parole, gave rise to a fight with some group. It appears that as per the respondents, in the event of his release, the petitioner can misuse the concession of parole.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the previous incident had taken place more than 3 years back and thereafter the petitioner's conduct in jail has been assessed to be good.

The impugned order does not specify as to whether the petitioner's house requires repairs or not.

Even if the petitioner's conduct is good, he cannot be released on parole unless a case for “sufficient cause” under Section 3(1)(d) of the Haryana Good Conduct Prisoners (Temporary Release) Act, 1988 is made out.

Consequently, this petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to re-apply for parole along with supporting material to make out a case that his house requires urgent repairs and if any such application is moved by the petitioner, the respondent-authorities are directed to get the facts reverified and thereafter to dispose of the same in accordance with law within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

April 18, 2007 **(SURYA KANT)**
poonam **JUDGE**